REMARKS

By the present Amendment, sole independent claim 24 has been amended to define the invention with greater precision and new claim 26 has been added to recite additional aspects of the present invention. In particular, claim 24 has been amended to recite the presence of 0.01 to 0.5 wt.% of a chelating agent consistent with the description provided in the specification such as at page 55, lines 3-7. In addition, claim 24 has been amended to recite that the amount of the nonionic aromatic ether-based activator is greater than the amount of surfactant in the developing solution. This understanding can be reached by considering the 40 illustrative developing solutions set forth starting on page 95 of the specification. In each and every one of the solutions, the amount of compound of formula (I) is greater than the amount of surfactant and in many of the illustrative developing solutions, there is no surfactant present, which is itself consistent with the description provided on page 56 which indicates that various surfactants are optional (i.e., "may be added to the developing solution"). The specific chelating agents recited in new claim 26 are used in certain of the illustrative Examples and are described at the top of page 96 of the specification.

The various aspects of the present invention defined in the claims of record are neither anticipated by nor obvious over Suzuki et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,532,116. Suzuki et al. describes an aqueous alkaline developing solution comprising an alkali compound, water and an alkylnaphthalene sulfonate having the formula illustrated in the Abstract. The developing solution further contains a defined anionic surface active agent and a nonionic surface active agent having a polyoxyethylene moiety

and an aromatic ring in its structure. The Examiner has relied on the disclosure of the patent particularly in columns 9-11, 17 and 18.

It is a basic principle of patent law that each and every recitation in claims must be considered , *see In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 1572, 37 USPQ2d 1127, 1133 (Fed. Cir. 1995). The developing solution of claim 24 first recites 2-10 wt% of at least one nonionic aromatic ether-based activator represented by formula (I-B) wherein n represents an integer of from 5 to 30. Suzuki et al. is clearly designed around the defined anionic surfactant of an alkylnaphthalene sulfonate. Indeed, while the abstract mentions the presence of a nonionic surfactant, a number of the illustrative Developing Solutions do not describe the presence of a nonionic surfactant (see Developing Solutions 4-7). Furthermore, to the extent that the illustrative Developing Solutions contain a nonionic surfactant, **none** meet the nonionic aromatic ether-based activator represented by formula (I-B). In this respect, nonionic surface active agent (C-2) identified at the bottom of column 20 only contains 4 ethoxy units as opposed to the range of 5 to 30 units recited in claim 24. Still further, the presently claimed amount of activator is based on the developing solution which can be further understood with regard to the illustrative developing solutions described on page 95 of the specification. This claimed amount is not taught by Suzuki et al. which uses far less nonionic surface active agent which is consistent with the importance placed on the defined anionic surfactant of an alkylnaphthalene sulfonate. In this regard, the amounts of nonionic surface active agent set forth at column 9, lines 28-31 are before dilution and the illustrative Developing Solutions which even contain a nonionic surface active agent

(again not the claimed activator) contain the agent in an amount of less than 0.3 wt% of the developing solution.

Suzuki et al. is further deficient by failing to teach the claimed amount of chelating agent. While chelating agents are incidentally mentioned at the top of column 18, the patent does not disclose the presently claimed amount. Moreover, the patent certainly does not teach the specific chelating agents recited in claim 26.

As yet a further point of distinction, Suzuki et al. completely fails to teach that the amount of the nonionic aromatic ether-based activator is greater than the amount of surfactant in the developing solution. In fact, given the emphasis in the patent relating to the defined anionic surfactant of an alkylnaphthalene sulfonate, it would be directly contrary to the teachings of the patent to use more nonionic surface active agent than the defined anionic surfactant of an alkylnaphthalene sulfonate. Indeed, if one considers the illustrative Developing Solutions which contain a nonionic surface active agent, the amount of the defined anionic surfactant of an alkylnaphthalene sulfonate is over 50 times as much as the nonionic surface active agent.

Thus, taking into consideration the numerous distinctions between the claims of record and the teachings of Suzuki et al., those of ordinary skill in the art can only come to the conclusion that the claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the patent. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss any aspect of the present application, he is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC
(INCLUDING ATTORNEYS FROM BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS)

By: _____
Robert G. Mukai
Registration No. 28,531

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-662

Date: February 10, 2006